

TWISTING THE DEMON'S TAIL

Two Hours of Frothy Temperance Oratory
in the Iowa Upper House.

SENATOR SUTTON SAT DOWN ON

**Bill Providing the State May Take
Change of Venue in Criminal Cases
Meets With Opposition and
is Indefinitely Postponed.**

Prohibition Platitudes.

prohibition oratory, the senate this afternoon, which was quite stalling for a little while, but not serious in its effects. Senator Sutton's bill providing that the state may take a change of venue in criminal cases on the single motion of the district attorney or attorney general, was reported back by the judiciary committee with the recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed. Senator Sutton thereupon asked for the reasons for this recommendation. The chair-

man of the judiciary committee, Senator Robinson, said it proposed to do away with one of the fundamental rights which every man claimed, the right when accused to be

Senator Sutton forthwith launched into an exciting argument for his bill, and the friends of Magna Charta put the old instrument on trial. Sutton maintained that whereas he alleged was the case in sixteenth-century England, it was not the case in

whereas, he alleged, was "in excess of sixty-six cities and towns of the state, the prohibitory law was openly disregarded and violated, and it was a shame that law-breakers could not be convicted of their crimes, that the state should in order to vindicate itself be allowed to transfer the cases to communities where a fair jury could be obtained. He said that some of the prohibitionists were so full of zeal that they screamed lustily from the house tops for the enforcement

ment of prohibition, but when effectual means were proposed they drew back and refused to take hold of them. He said he was sick and tired of so much talk that seemed to be only for political effect. Sentimental talk about enforcement was very pretty, but it did not go far if it stopped with talk. There were cities defying the law and nothing was being done about it. If the temperance people were really sincere in their de-

mand for enforcing the law, they would adopt some such measure as his bill proposed.

Senator Clark of Page, one of the strongest prohibition republicans in the state, opposed the bill, claiming that it would work injustice in many cases. If it had been confined to the removal of the prohibitory law, he thought he would have favored it, but when it proposed to take away the natural rights of all citizens to be tried by a jury of their peers of the vicinity, he thought that was going too far.

Senator Bolter spoke for the democrats, and made a violent attack upon the bill, calling it diabolical, infamous and worthy only of a despotic government. He made a long and powerful speech harangue against prohibition, and closed by saying that when the measure to which this bill was only an adjunct came up for discussion, he should make

His attack upon prohibition called up Mr. Clark, who is the Patrick Henry of the senate. He poured out a torrent of eloquent words in defense of the non-partisan idea of temperance. He said that the democratic party was responsible for bringing it into the world, for the first prohibitory law ever passed in this state was passed by a democratic legislature. If, as the senator from Harrison had said, the prohibitory law had created crime, then every law on the statute books had created crimes instead of being ordered to suppress evils. He replied to Sutton's statement that a change of venue was the last resort in law; defending the communities by saying that

Sutton made a vehement reply and said that though he had often heard the name

that though he had often heard the democratic party cry about "personal liberty," this was the first time in his life he had heard it from a prohibitionist republican. He was not surprised to hear such talk from Senator Bolter, for the democratic party had made it its chief business to oppose prohibition and hinder its enforcement. A saloon victory had always been claimed as a democratic victory, but he could not understand how prohibition should

Real Estate Transfers.

The following transfers were filed Feb 2, with the county clerk, and reported by the recorder:

for the BEE by Ames' Real Estate Agency:

Geo. W. Ames and wife to Katie Roman, n. 1/2, 2nd and 24, blk 1, Ames' Place, Omaha, w d—\$500.

Lydia C. Anderson (widow) to Francis L. McKinnis, 3 and 3 1/2, blk 1, Shinn's Second add, Omaha, w d—\$750.

Myrtle M. A. Rogers (single) to Omaha Belt R. R. Co., 1 3/4 acre (through sec 20-15-13, 14, Douglas county, w d—\$1,375.

Lorenzo V. Morse and wife and others to Mary M. Hett, 12, blk 3, Kirkwood add, Omaha, w d—\$250.

Ira Van Camp and wife and others to Mary M. Hett, 15, Van Camp & Eddy's subdivision of blk M, Shinn's Second add, Omaha w d—\$300.

William E. Lee to William R. Kissel, 1 1/2, sec 1-16-9, 29 90-100 acres, Douglas county, w d—\$1,800.

William R. Kissel and wife to Henry J. Lee, Jr., sec 1-16-9, 29 90-100 acres, Douglas county, w d—\$300.

Fred Dassel and wife to Charles McCarty, sec 1-16-9, 29 90-100 acres, Douglas county, w d—\$300.

Elizabeth J. Morrow (single) to Calvin P. Elkins, lot 6, blk E, Lowe's First add, Omaha, w d—\$400.

It 16, blk 2, Hanscom Place, Omaha, w d—
\$3,000.
John H. Horbach and wife to Wm. L.
Snyder, 110 acres of sw¹/₄ sec 19-15-13, Douglas
County, w d—\$4,550.
William F. Snyder and wife to John T.
Bell and others, 70 acres of sw¹/₄ sec 19-15-
13, Douglas County, w d—\$4,500.

noon. The object of the incorporation is stated to be the publishing of a humorous illustrated weekly paper. The capital stock is fixed at \$5,000 in shares of \$100

each. The incorporators are W. A. Morrison, H. D. Schinker, Jacob Hauck and Jerome C. Pentzel.

Fur robes and winter caps. Reduced prices. Frederick, Bith and Fane m.